

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/775,745	MOORE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew Heneghan	2134	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Pending

 (1) Matthew Heneghan.

(3) _____.

 (2) Joseph Hetz.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2006
Time: 6:30 PM EDT
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

28


Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The Examiner proposed an Examiner's amendment, in the event that the application was found to be allowable, to correct a typographical error in claim 28. Attorney Hetz agreed to the amendment.

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)